

REMARKS/ARGUMENTSClaim Status

Claims 1-12 are pending. Claims 1-12 stand rejected. Claims 1, 4, 7, and 12 stand objected to.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 11, and 12 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled.

Claim Objections

Claims 1 7, and 12 stand objected to because of the use of the phrase "the computer." Claims 1, 7, and 12 have been amended by replacing "the computer" with "a particular one of the plurality of computers," which has clear antecedent basis in each claim. Applicant therefore requests that the objection to claims 1, 7, and 12 be withdrawn.

Claim 4 stands objected to for being unclear for lack of commas. Claim 4 has been amended by separating the text of the claim into distinct paragraphs, thereby achieving an equivalent effect to the addition of commas as suggested by the Office Action. Applicant therefore requests that the objection to claim 4 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 as being indefinite for use of the phrase "the computer." Claim 12 has been amended by replacing "the computer" with "a particular one of the plurality of computers," which is unambiguous. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection of claim 12 be withdrawn.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-12 of the instant application stand rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, and 11 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,654,902.

Applicant hereby submits a terminal disclaimer to overcome the double-patenting rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,260,120 to Blumenau et al.

This rejection is moot in light of the amendments made herein. For example, claim 1 has been amended to specify that a failure of the registered computer is detected, and that in response to detection of the failure, the registered computer is de-registered with the storage device and re-registered with a new identifier. These amendments find clear support in the specification. For

example, detection of a failure of a computer is described at p. 13, lines 8-12, de-registering of the failed computer is described at p. 13, line 29 - p. 14, line 23, and the re-registration of the failed computer is described at p. 14, lines 24-29 and p. 12, lines 26-32.

Blumenau does not teach these express limitations of claim 1, as amended. For example, the portion of Blumenau cited by the Office Action merely describes changing the S\_ID (source address) of a host controller upon booting the host controller, not detecting a failure of the host controller or de-registering and re-registering the host controller, as expressly recited by claim 1, as amended.

Claim 1, as amended, therefore patentably distinguishes over Blumenau. Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1 and therefore patentably distinguish over Blumenau for at least the same reasons.

Claim 4 has been amended in substantially the same manner as claim 1 and therefore patentably distinguishes over Blumenau for at least the same reasons. Claims 5-6 depend from claim 4 and therefore patentably distinguish over Blumenau for at least the same reasons.

Claim 7 has been amended in substantially the same manner as claim 1 and therefore patentably distinguishes over Blumenau for at least the same reasons. Claims 8-10 depend from claim 7 and therefore patentably distinguish over Blumenau for at least the same reasons.

Claim 11 has been amended in substantially the same manner as claim 1 and therefore patentably distinguishes over Blumenau for at least the same reasons.

Claim 12 has been amended in substantially the same manner as claim 1 and therefore patentably distinguishes over Blumenau for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSIONS

Any dependent claims not specifically discussed above depend, either directly or indirectly, from the independent claims discussed above and therefore are patentable for at least the same reason(s).

If the Examiner wishes to discuss this Response, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the phone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for extension of time is otherwise absent, applicant hereby requests any extension of time. Please charge any fees or make any credits, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert Plotkin/

Robert Plotkin, Esq.

Reg. No. 43,861

April 27, 2007

Date

Robert Plotkin, P.C.  
91 Main Street, Suite 204  
Concord, MA 01742-2527  
Tel: (978) 318-9914  
Fax: (978) 318-9060